

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 26, 2004. An appropriate Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

Claims 1-73 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-73. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Claims 1-2, 7-9, 11-13, 21-23, 25, 39, 41, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as be anticipated by OrderManager (a collation of prior art describing Order Manager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X)

OrderManager is an internet commerce software that automates sale and procurement transactions up and down the supply chain.

Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A system for providing a web site, comprising:
 - a plurality of business modules from which a company-user selects a set of business modules;
 - wherein each business module provides a respective function;
 - wherein each business module is associated with a respective plurality of templates, wherein a set of templates is selectable by a company-user from each respective plurality of templates;
 - wherein said templates control the functionality performed by the system and the display of information by the system; and
 - wherein said templates are customizable to display graphical elements selected by the company-user.

Claim 1 includes having business modules providing different functions. Each business module is associated with a plurality of templates. A set of templates is selectable by the company user from each of the respective plurality templates.

The OrderManager prior art describes a selection between two different look-and-feels for the OrderManager, but the OrderManager prior art does not indicate that the different templates are associated with individual business modules. For that reason, claim 1 is believed

to be allowable. Claims 2-11 are dependent upon claim 1 and for that reason and because of the additional limitations of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 12 reads as follows:

12. A system for providing a web site, comprising:
 - a set of business modules selected by a company-user;
 - wherein each business module provides a respective function;
 - wherein each business module is capable of performing a plurality of commands related to its function and is customizable to perform a set of those commands selected by the company-user;
 - wherein each business module is associated with a plurality of generic web pages that are customizable to have a look and feel selected by the company-user.

Claims 12 includes having business modules capable of performing a plurality of commands related to its function, business modules being customizable to perform a set of command selected by the company user. There is no discussion in the OrderManager prior art of customizing business modules to perform a set of commands selected by a company user. The selection of different templates appear only to deal with the look-and-feel for the entire system in the OrderManager prior art rather than the selection of the customization to implement a set of commands selected by a company user, as described in claim 12. For this reason, claim 12 is believed to be allowable. Claims 13-25 are dependent upon claim 12 and for that reason and because of the additional limitations of these claims the claims are believed to be allowable.

Claims 39 reads as follows:

39. A method for use in a system for providing a web site, comprising:
 - receiving an end-user request from a web browser by a system that includes a selected set of business modules, where each business module is associated with a respective function and where the functions performed by each business module are selected by a company-user;
 - processing the end-user request by the system, and invoking, by the system, an appropriate business module to implement the end-user request;
 - receiving resulting data from the appropriate business module; and
 - generating a web page including graphical elements selected by the company-user and including at least some of the resulting data for display by the web browser as a response to the end-user request.

In claim 39, the functions performed by each business module are selected by a company user. This is not shown, suggested, or given a motivation for in the OrderManager prior art or any other cited reference. Additionally, the end-user request processed and invoked by the

system and an appropriate business module to implement the end-user request is not shown, suggested, or given a motivation for in the OrderManager reference. For these reasons, claim 39 is believed to be allowable. Claims 40-43 are dependent upon claim 39 and are believed to be allowable for that reason and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Claim 44 reads as follows:

44. A method for use with a system for providing a web site, comprising:
selecting and installing a set of business modules selected from a plurality of business modules, where each business module is associated with a respective function;
selecting for each business module a set of predefined generic web page templates, where each template is associated with a respective action; and
customizing each selected template to achieve a selected look and feel.

The combination of selecting and installing the business modules, selecting for each business module the predetermined webpage template and customizing each selected template to achieve a selected look and feel is not shown, suggested, or disclosed in the OrderManager reference. For this reason claim 44 is believed to be allowable. Claims 45-46 are dependent upon claim 44 and for that reason and because of the additional limitation of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claims 72-73 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yen et al. (PTO-982, Item XX).

Claims 72 reads as follows:

72. A method, comprising:
storing a session ID on a client computer;
storing a session state corresponding to the session ID on a session state server, wherein the session state can be accessed by more than one application server.

The Yen reference does not show, suggest or give a motivation for a session state server accessed by more than one application server. For this reason claim 72 is believed to be allowable. Claim 73 is dependent upon claim 72 and for that reason and because of the additional limitations of this claim, this claim is believed to be allowable.

Claims 1-6, 16-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items W-X), in view of Tech Data (a collection of prior art describing Tech Data's extranet, PTO-892, Item: U-V).

With respect to claims 3-4, and 16-17, the Tech Data reference collection alone or in combination with the OrderManager collection of prior art, does not produce a system of the claimed invention since none of the cited art has a locate module. The Tech Data reference describes a system where Tech Data can produce a backend for another website. As described in the “U” reference, a Tech Data customer, such as Joe’s Computer Store, could use the Tech Data extranet to create its own website. For example, an end-user could log onto Joe’s Computer Store and get information from the Tech Data’s database and order computers that are shipped by Tech Data but are privately labeled for Joe’s Computer Store. There is no locate module used to identify sales location. Tech Data does not describe a situation where the user goes to a central website and use a locate module to identify a nearby sales location.

For these reasons claims 3-4 and 16-17 are believed to be allowable. Claims 5-6 and 20 are dependent upon independent claims 1 and 12 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claims 10 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X).

The ability to remove business functionality by removing business modules provides flexibility to the system of the present invention that is not disclosed, suggested or given a motivation for in the cited prior art. For this additional reason, claims 10 and 24 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManaber cited in PTO-892, Item: W-X). Claims 14-15 are dependent upon independent claim 12 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatenable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X). in view of the Tech Data (a collection of prior art describing Tech Data’s extranet PTO-892, Items: U-V).

A second set of business modules provided by a partner as claimed in claims 18 and 19 are not shown, suggested or given a motivation for in the cited references. For this reason claims 18 and 19 are believed to be allowable. Additionally, claims 18 and 19 are dependent upon claims 12 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claims 26-27, 29-35, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X).

Claims 26 reads as follows:

26. A system for providing a web site, comprising:
a foundation, wherein:
the foundation is adapted to interact with a web browser;
the foundation serves as an interface between each of a plurality of business modules and the web browser;
the foundation is adapted to interact with any of the business modules such that selected business modules can be added to or subtracted from the system; and
upon receiving a request from the web browser, the foundation is adapted to invoke the business module appropriate to the request to carry out the request.

Claim 26 includes upon receiving a request from the web browser the foundation is adapted to invoke a business module appropriate to the request to carry out the request. This arrangement of the foundation with business modules which can be added or subtracted to the system is not shown or suggested in the cited prior art. It is not clear that the OrderManager system includes a foundation to invoke the business modules appropriate to a request. The use of the foundation allows the business modules to be easily added and subtracted from the system while the foundation is used as an interface between the business modules and the web browser. This is not shown or suggested in any of the cited references. For this reason, claim 26 and dependent claims 27-30 are believed to be allowable.

Additionally, these claims include indications of the business modules and be added and subtracted in the system and that the foundation includes resources commonly used by the business modules. Such limitations are not shown or suggested in the cited prior art. For these additional reasons, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable.

Claims 36-38 are dependent upon claim 31 and are believed to be allowable for that reason.

Claims 28, 36, 40, and 42 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X), in view of Gauthier et al. (PTO-982, Item WW).

The combination of the Gauthier with the OrderManager does not produce the system of the claimed invention for these claims. For example, claim 28 includes consulting the context

object for the identification of the specific business module. Such a consulting of a context object is not shown or suggested by the combination of the OrderManager and the Gauthier reference. Claims 36 and 40 also describe context of objects which are not shown, suggested or given motivation for, by the cited prior art. Claim 42 is dependent upon independent claim 39 and for that reason and because of additional limitations of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-982, Item: W-X). Claim 43 is dependent upon claim 39 and for that reason is believed to be allowable.

Claims 41-71 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTE-982, Items: W-X), in view to Tech Data (a collection of prior art describing Tech Data's extranet, PTO-892, Item: U-V), further in view of the Business Wire (PTO-892, Item: UU

Claims 47 reads as follows:

47. A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of one or more modules previously selected from a plurality of modules, where the plurality of modules includes:
an assess module designed to determine the end-user's needs and provide a personalized product recommendation;
a catalog module designed to display and maintain product information;
a build module designed to enable the end-user to interactively assemble products and services specific to the end-user's needs;
a compare module designed to allow the end-user to compare multiple products;
a promote module designed to allow the end-user to view promotional information;
a finance module designed to give a end-user the ability to examine financing scenarios;
a transact module designed to facilitate a sales transaction.

Claim 47 includes an assess module designed to determine the end-users needs and provide a personalized product recommendation. None of the cited references alone or in combination describes such an assess module which determines the end-users needs and provides a personalized product recommendation. Claim 47 also includes a finance module designed to give an end-user the ability to examine financing scenarios. This is not the same as the account management payment process described in the OrderManager reference. The ability to examine different financing scenarios can be useful to evaluate different ways to purchase an item such as

a car. A client finance module with the ability to examine different financing scenarios is not described, suggested or given a motivation for in any of the cited references. Claims 48-53 are dependent upon claim 47 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claim 54 as amended reads as follows:

54. A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of modules that includes:
a catalog module;
a transact module; and
a loyalty module designed to provide relationship building activities with the end-user.

Claim 54 as amended now states that the loyalty module is designed to provide relationship building activities with the end-user. Such a system is not described in the cited prior art. For example, the OrderManager system provides discounts to the resellers but does not focus on the end-user customer.

Claim 55 reads as follows:

55. A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of modules that includes:
a build module;
a catalog module;
a transact module; and
a locate module.

None of the cited references describe a locate module. For this reason, claim 55 is believed to be allowable. Claims 56-58 are dependent upon claim 55 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claim 59 reads as follows:

59. A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of modules that includes:
a assess module;
a catalog module;
a transact module; and
a locate module.

Claims 59 includes an assess module and a locate module. None of the cited prior art includes an assess module or a locate module. In one embodiment, an assess module can be used

to determine an end-users needs and provide a personalized produce recommendation and the locate module can be used to identify a sales location. No such assess module and locate module described in the prior art references alone or in combination. Claims 60-61 are dependent upon claim 59 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claim 62 reads as follows:

62. A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of modules that includes:
an assess module;
a build module;
a catalog module;
a transact module; and
a locate module.

None of the cited references alone or in combination include an assess module or a locate module. For this reason, claim 62 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 63 reads as follows:

63. A method for conducting e-commerce, comprising:
assessing an end-user's needs;
displaying to the end-user product information;
allowing the end-user to assemble customized products;
allowing the end-user to compare a plurality of products;
displaying to the end-user promotion information;
displaying to the end-user financing information;
locating a sales location based on information provided by the end-user; and
forwarding information to the sales location identifying the end-user and any products selected by the end-user in order to complete a sales transaction.

The steps of assessing an end-user's needs, locating a sales location based upon information provided by the end-user and forwarding the information to a sales location identifying the end-user and any products selected by the end-users in order to complete a sales transaction are not shown, suggested or given a motivation for, in any of the cited references. Claims 64-65 are dependent upon claim 63 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claim 66 reads as follows:

66. A computer readable medium have a set of instructions stored therein which when executed by a computer causes the computer to provide an on-line sales environment by performing the following steps in response to respective on-line end-user requests:
assessing an end-user's needs;
displaying to the end-user product and service information;

allowing the end-user to assemble customized products;
allowing the end-user to compare a plurality of products;
displaying to the end-user promotion information;
displaying to the end-user financing information;
locating a sales location based on information provided by the end-user; and
forwarding information to the sales location identifying the end-user and any products
selected by the end-user in order to complete a sales transaction.

As cited above with respect to claims 63, none of the cited references include the assessing, locating and forwarding steps of this claims. For this reason, this claim 66 is believed to be allowable. Claims 67 and 68 are dependent upon claim 66 and for that reason and because of the additional limitations of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 69 includes pages for accessing an end-user's needs and pages for displaying a sales location based upon information provided by the end-user. Such a system is not shown, suggested or given motivation for by the cited references. For this reason claim 69 is believed to be allowable.

Similarly claim 70 reads as follows:

70. A method for use by a system that includes a display, comprising:
displaying a page for use in assessing an end-user's needs;
displaying a page with product and service information;
displaying a page for use in assembling customized products;
displaying a page for use in to comparing a plurality of products;
displaying a page with promotion information;
displaying a page with financing information;
displaying a page with a sales location based on information provided by the end-user;
and
displaying a page for use in completing a sales transaction.

Claim 70 similar to claim 69 includes a step of displaying a page for assessing an end-user's needs and displaying a page with sales locations based on information provided by the end-user. Such steps are not shown, suggested or given a motivation for in any of the cited references.

Claim 71 reads as follows:

71. A system for providing an online sales environment, comprising:
a company user web site that interfaces with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process;
a partner web site that interfaces with the end-user;

wherein the partner web site is constructed utilizing a site builder module adapted to allow the partner to build a company-user-approved web site;

wherein the company-user web site gathers sales lead information from an end-user and passes said sales lead information to the partner to complete a sales transaction with the end-user.

Claim 71 includes the step that the company-user website gathers sales lead information from an end-user and passes the sales lead information to the partner to complete a sales transaction with an end-user. Such a step is not shown, suggested or given motivation for in any of the cited references. For this reason, claim 71 is believed to be allowable.


For the discussed reasons the above claims are believed to be allowable and such is respectfully requested.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, July 26, 2004.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/26/04

By: 
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800